

wherein said control means detects manual operation of said operating ring on the basis of a difference between a drive state of said optical member corresponding to a drive command, and an actually driven state of said optical member.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

A. **Status of the Claims And Explanation Of Amendments**

Claims 1-18 were pending. Applicant notes with appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-7, 10-13 and 15-17. To that end, applicant has cancelled previously pending claims 5 and 17 and represented them as new claims 19 and 20. Claims 6-7 and 10-12 have been amended to depend from new claim 19, instead of cancelled claim 5. Accordingly, at least claims 6-7, 10-12, 19 and 20 are asserted to be in condition for allowance.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 14 were amended. Many of the changes were to conform to the norms of American practice (*e.g.*, changing “which transmits” to “when can transmit.”) In addition, these claims were amended to clarify that the control means accomplishes its switching “by detecting a signal of the motor drive source.” Support for this amendment is found throughout the originally filed specification. Applicant respectfully asserts that no new matter would be added to this application by entry of these amendments.

As to the merits, claims 1, 8, 14 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,227,929 to Imanari et al. (“Imanari”). Claim 9 also was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Imanari. For at least the reasons discussed below, these rejections are traversed.

B. Claims 1-4, 8-9, 13-16, And 18 Are Patentably Distinct From Imanari

The above rejections are respectfully traversed, because the cited reference fails to teach, disclose or even suggest all of the features recited in applicant's claims as required. *See* MPEP §§ 2131 at 2100-70 (anticipation) and 2143.03 at 2100-128 (obviousness). Applicant's claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“control means capable of switching said switching mechanism between the state for motor-driving said optical member and the state for canceling motor driving of said optical member, wherein said control means is configured to switch said switching mechanism to the state for canceling motor driving of said optical member on the basis of manual operation of said operating ring when said switching mechanism is set in the state for motor-driving said optical member by detecting a signal of the motor drive source.”

Imanari is directed to a photographing lens switchable between manual focus and auto focus modes. Most generally, Imanari uses a mode selection switch 113 to toggle between an auto-focus (“AF”) mode where the lens is driven by a motor and a manual focus (“MF”) mode where the lens is driven by the photographer. In a “AF Mode with Preference to MF Mode” discussed at Column 5, lines 21-66, Imanari permits the photographer to manipulate the lens even in the AF mode:

[I]f the photographer does not manipulate the mode selection switch 113 but rotates the distance ring 115 like the MF mode, the rotation detector 116 detects the rotation of the distance ring 115 and supplies a detection signal to the CPU 110 in the lens. . . . In this manner, the photographer can take photograph in the MF mode without switching the mode from AF mode to the MF mode by the mode selection switch 113. (Imanari, Col. 5, lns. 33-45)

In other words, Imanari senses manual operation by detecting changes in the position of the distance ring 115. Accordingly, Imanari fails to teach, disclose or suggest “said

control means is configured to switch said switching mechanism to the state for canceling motor driving of said optical member on the basis of manual operation of said operating ring when said switching mechanism is set in the state for motor-driving said optical member by detecting a signal of the motor drive source” as recited in Applicant’s claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant’s independent claim 1 is asserted to be patentably distinct from the cited reference. Dependent claims 1-4, 8-9 and 13, and independent claim 14 (“wherein said control means is configured to switch said switching mechanism to the state for canceling motor driving of said optical member on the basis of manual operation of said operating ring when said switching mechanism is set in the state for motor-driving said optical member by detecting a signal of the motor drive source”) and its dependent claims 15-16 and 18 also are believed to be patentably distinct for at least similar reasons.

Appl. No. 09/626,230

Paper dated February 3, 2004

Reply to Office Action dated November 12, 2003

CONCLUSION


For the above-stated reasons, this application is respectfully asserted to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable examination on the merits is requested. In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate the examination of this application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

THE COMMISSIONER IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO CHARGE ANY ADDITIONAL FEES WHICH MAY BE REQUIRED FOR THE TIMELY CONSIDERATION OF THIS AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 AND 1.17, OR CREDIT ANY OVERPAYMENT TO DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 13-4500, ORDER NO. 1232-4637.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: February 3, 2004

By:


Matthew K. Blackburn
Registration No. 47,428

Correspondence Address:

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154-0053
(212) 758-4800 Telephone
(212) 751-6849 Facsimile